United Nations CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/2

Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Distr.: General
18 June 2018

Original: English

Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption
Vienna, 5–7 September 2018
Item 2 (a) of the provisional agenda*
Implementation of Conference resolutions 7/5, entitled "Promoting preventive measures against corruption", and 7/6, entitled "Follow-up to the Marrakech declaration on the prevention of corruption": thematic discussion on preventing and managing conflicts of interest (article 7, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption)

Preventing and managing conflicts of interest (article 7, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption)

Background paper prepared by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 6/1, the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption requested the Secretariat to structure the provisional agendas of the subsidiary bodies established by the Conference in such a way as to avoid duplication of discussions, while respecting their mandates. The Conference further requested the Secretariat, in its resolution 6/6, to continue to identify comparative good practices on measures to prevent corruption and to facilitate the exchange of expertise and lessons learned among States parties.

2. In its resolution 7/6, entitled "Follow-up to the Marrakech declaration on the prevention of corruption", the Conference decided that the Working Group should continue its work to advise and assist the Conference in the implementation of its mandate on the prevention of corruption and should hold at least two meetings prior to the eighth session of the Conference.

3. In its resolution 7/5, entitled "Promoting preventive measures against corruption", the Conference decided that the Working Group should include as the topic for 2018 the use and effectiveness of asset declaration systems and conflicts of interest.

* CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/1/Rev.1

V.18-04122 (E) 260618 270618

Please recycle

4. In the light of these resolutions, it was decided that the topics for discussion at the ninth intersessional meeting of the Working Group, to be held in Vienna from 5 to 7 September 2018, would be:

(a) Preventing and managing conflicts of interest (art. 7, para. 4);

(b) Asset and interest disclosure systems (art. 8, para. 5).

5. At its second meeting, held in Vienna from 22 to 24 August 2011, the Working Group recommended that in advance of each of its future meetings, States parties should be invited to share their experiences of implementing the provisions under consideration, preferably by using the self-assessment checklist and including, where possible, successes, challenges, technical assistance needs and lessons learned in implementation. The Working Group requested the Secretariat to prepare background papers synthesizing that information and decided that panel discussions should be held during its meetings, involving experts from countries that had provided written responses on the priority themes under consideration.

6. In accordance with these requests, the present report has been prepared on the basis of information relating to the implementation of article 7, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption provided by Governments in response to the note verbale of the Secretary-General dated 27 February 2018 and the reminder note verbale dated 26 April 2018.[1] As of 18 June 2018, submissions had been received from 44 States. The submissions from the following 40 countries contained information relating to the topic of conflict of interest: Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechia, Egypt, El Salvador, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lithuania, Montenegro, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States of America.

7. With the agreement of the countries concerned, the full text of the submissions has been made available on the website of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)[2] and incorporated into the thematic website developed by the Secretariat.[3]

8. The present report does not purport to be comprehensive but rather endeavours to provide a summary of the information submitted by States parties and signatories.

II. Analysis of submissions of States parties and signatories

A. Thematic background

9. The impartiality and professionalism of public officials are key for the integrity of the public administration. The correct, honourable and proper performance of public functions, without personal consideration, is a precondition for the effectiveness of public institutions and for ensuring the trust of the public in government.

10. The importance of building the public administration in accordance with the principles of integrity, transparency and accountability is underlined in chapter II of the Convention against Corruption, in particular in its articles 7 and 8.

11. Article 7, paragraph 4, of the Convention calls upon States parties to, in accordance with the fundamental principles of their domestic law, endeavour to adopt,

[1] A summary of information submitted by States relating to asset and interest disclosure systems in the context of article 8, paragraph 5, of the Convention is provided in a separate background paper by the Secretariat (CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/3).

[2] Available at www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/WG-Prevention/session9.html.

[3] Available at www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/WG-Prevention/conflict-of-interest.html.

maintain and strengthen systems that promote transparency and prevent conflicts of interest.

12. This requirement of the Convention is reinforced by article 8, paragraph 5, which requires States parties to endeavour, where appropriate and in accordance with the fundamental principles of their domestic law, to establish measures and systems requiring public officials to make declarations to appropriate authorities regarding, inter alia, their outside activities, employment, investments, assets and substantial gifts or benefits from which a conflict of interest may result with respect to their functions as public officials.

13. In its resolution 7/5, the Conference, emphasizing the need to properly manage conflicts of interest and to establish asset disclosure systems, encouraged States parties to promote, in accordance with the fundamental principles of their legal systems, the adoption, maintenance and strengthening of systems that promote transparency and prevent conflicts of interest and, where appropriate, to make use of innovative and digital instruments in this field.

14. The importance of measures to prevent conflict of interest in the private sector was also underlined in Conference resolution 7/5, as well as in resolution 6/5, entitled "St. Petersburg statement on promoting public-private partnership in the prevention of and fight against corruption".

15. The Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption had addressed the implementation of provisions in article 7, paragraph 4, and article 8, paragraph 5, of the Convention at its third intersessional meeting held in Vienna in 2012.[4]

B. Regulation of conflicts of interest

16. The proper prevention and regulation of conflicts of interest in the public administration is only possible following the adoption of clear, known, written standards.

17. In this regard, many States outlined how written standards in the form of primary and secondary legislation and codes of conduct were employed to regulate and provide guidance to officials as to the types of activities from which they should refrain in order to avoid conflicts of interest.

18. A number of States also emphasized how legislative measures focused on conflicts of interest and other practices targeted at "high-risk" sectors, such as public procurement, had sought to reduce the likelihood of conflicts of interest in those sectors.

19. The measures, policies and practices adopted by States to address the issue of conflicts of interest reflects the comprehensive approach to the prevention of corruption required by chapter II of the Convention. The practical examples of implementation submitted by States parties provide evidence of the importance of adopting a holistic approach to effectively address the issue of conflicts of interest throughout the public service.

1. Approach to regulation

20. States parties reported different approaches to regulating conflicts of interest. While many countries reported having adopted specific laws on the regulation of conflicts of interest, the majority of submissions referred to regulating conflicts of interest through legal provisions contained in the general legislation on the civil service or even in the Constitution. In some States, codes of conduct were used in addition to legislation to effectively manage the conflicts of interest.

[4] See the note by the Secretariat on conflicts of interest, reporting acts of corruption and asset declarations, particularly in the context of articles 7–9 of the Convention (CAC/COSP/WG.4/2012/3).

21. Algeria, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, Egypt, El Salvador, Georgia, Italy, Lithuania, Montenegro, Oman, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and the Russian Federation reported that conflicts of interest in the public administration were regulated by means of a specific law on conflicts of interest. The advantage of this approach was the detailed and effective codification of the legal norms, which facilitated the understanding of and, ultimately, compliance with the provisions of the legislation.

22. Kuwait reported that provisions on the prevention of conflicts existed in different laws and that a draft specific law on conflicts of interest was currently pending before the National Assembly.

23. Egypt stated that conflict of interest management procedures were contained in the Constitution and the civil service law and aimed at preventing conflicts of interest with regard to the President, the Prime Minister and the ministers of the Government.

24. Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Belgium, Germany, Indonesia, Kiribati, Peru, Sierra Leone and Turkey described how conflicts of interest with regard to high-level officials were regulated by provisions in the general administrative laws of the country.

25. Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, El Salvador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Norway, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Peru, Poland and the United States reported that the legislation on the civil service contained norms dealing with the conflict of interest of civil servants.

26. Montenegro and Slovenia reported that the primary law regulating conflicts of interest was the law on the prevention of corruption.

27. Austria noted that conflicts of interest were regulated through both the civil service legislation and a code of ethics. Belgium reported that conflict of interest provisions were contained in multiple laws, including the law on public procurement, as well as in a code of ethics.

28. Germany indicated that the conflict of interest provisions were a part of the law on administrative procedure. In addition, specific rules on integrity and a code of conduct had been developed, providing guidance to public officials on how to avoid and manage conflicts of interest. The rules on integrity also contained guidance on issues related to accepting gifts and hospitality.

29. Indonesia indicated that conflicts of interest provisions were contained in the law on government administration and in other legislative acts. In addition, a code of ethics and general guidelines for handling conflicts of interest for public officials had been published.

30. Norway stated that the Public Administration Act regulated the prevention of conflicts of interest in the public administration. According to this law, a public official could be disqualified from the decision-making process if he or she had a conflict of interest. Rules promoting openness and preventing conflicts of interest were also contained in the Ethical Guidelines for the Public Service.

31. Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Czechia reported that they had adopted specific legislation focused on conflicts of interest. Argentina highlighted that the legislation required the disclosure and avoidance of not only the actual conflicts of interest but also the potential and apparent conflicts of interest in order to strengthen the trust of the public.

32. Georgia submitted information that a specific law, the Law on Conflict of Interest and Corruption in Public Service, and a general code of ethics and conduct for the civil service were used to regulate conflicts of interest.

33. Japan reported that the National Public Service Act and a code of ethics had been adopted, containing measures to avoid and manage conflicts of interest and to strengthen trust in government. Lithuania reported that the Law on the Adjustment of

Public and Private Interests in the Civil Service and the Law on the Civil Service contained provisions regulating conflicts of interest.

34. Hungary reported that conflicts of interest regulations concerning public officials were included in the act on government officials and State officials. Conflicts of interest involving law enforcement officials (police, prison guards, excise officers and disaster recovery staff) were regulated by the Law on the Service Status of the Professional Members of Law Enforcement Agencies. In addition, codes of ethics were adopted and enforced.

35. Kiribati reported that multiple laws contained provisions on managing and prohibiting conflicts of interest. An anti-corruption code of conduct was to be adopted, requiring the avoidance of conflict of interest within the public service.

36. Poland stated that the conflict of interest management regime was a part of the employment law and civil service act. In addition, the Guidelines on the Observance of Civil Service had been adopted, providing direction for public officials on what to do in situations of conflicts of interest.

2. Codes of conduct to regulate conflicts of interest

37. The introduction of a public sector ethics regime and the adoption of codes of conduct are important tools to effectively prevent and manage conflicts of interest. While there are many models and approaches to regulating public sector ethics, their ultimate goal is always to ensure that public officials know the boundaries of acceptable conduct and work in a way which promotes the effectiveness of institutions and public trust in those institutions.

38. Most of the States that provided submissions reported that they have codes of ethics and/or codes of conduct which they see as an important tool in regulating conflicts of interest. Some countries reported that codes were adopted through a legislative process or were a part of a law, while others developed aspirational codes to serve purely as guidance for their officials. While there is no single model for a code of conduct, there is a common understanding of the value of this instrument.

39. A number of countries including Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Norway and Switzerland reported that, in addition to their legislation which regulated conflicts of interest, codes of conduct were used to provide guidance to public officials on how to avoid, disclose and manage conflicts of interest.

40. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Panama, Peru, the Russian Federation, Singapore and the United States stated that the codes of conduct were mandatory and provided for sanctions in case of violations.

41. Austria reported that the Federal Chancellor's Office had developed a code of conduct to prevent corruption, which applied to all Austrian public officials. Furthermore, the different ministries had developed their own codes of conduct tailored to their specific requirements. The codes were made available on the ministries' websites and provided guidelines and rules for different types of conflict of interest such as the receipt of gifts and outside activities.

42. Similarly, Italy reported that two different levels of codes of conduct had been put in place: a general code for all public servants and individual codes for each public entity. The codes defined the standard of conduct for public officials and established general principles of conduct, such as the prohibition on accepting gifts. Violation of those codes would lead to disciplinary sanctions.

43. Panama reported that a code of ethics had been adopted which contained rules on conflict of interest management.

3. Sanctions

44. The issue of sanctions for violations of the conflict of interest legislation was addressed differently in the legislation of the States parties, with no single identifiable trend. While most of the submissions indicated that administrative or disciplinary measures were used against officials who did not comply with the conflict of interest regime, some countries also provided for criminal sanctions for violations of a law that regulated conflicts of interest.

45. Many States parties reported that the violation of codes of ethics might entail sanctions, while there were also examples of legal systems in which the provisions of codes of ethics were of a purely aspirational character. Austria, for example, reported that there were no sanctions when public officials failed to comply with the applicable conflict of interest regulations.

46. Algeria and Chile reported that the failure to comply with the conflict of interest legislation was a criminal offence and was regulated by the criminal code.

47. Czechia reported that its law on conflicts of interest provided for administrative penalties for the violation of its provisions. Hungary stated that a violation of the conflict of interest regime led to sanctions under the employment law.

48. Indonesia reported that violations of the conflicts of interest provisions in the law on government administration led to criminal and administrative sanctions.

49. Norway reported that when breaches of the Ethical Guidelines for the Public Service were seen as misconduct, they could be sanctioned with suspension or dismissal according to the Civil Service Act. The illegitimate receipt of gifts was explicitly sanctioned. Additionally, if the misconduct in question was also a breach of the Penal Code, a criminal charge might be applicable.

4. Scope of persons covered

50. One important aspect of conflict of interest management regimes is the scope of the categories of public officials that are covered by the conflict of interest legislation. In this respect, it was reported that different approaches were required for three specific groups: first, politically appointed public officials and high-level civil servants; second, public officials employed in the administration of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of power; and third, public officials with functions which were considered especially vulnerable to corruption such as officials engaged in procurement, customs, law enforcement or the judiciary.

51. Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosna and Herzegovina, Czechia, El Salvador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Montenegro, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Peru and the United States reported that their legislation provided for a specific regime for avoiding and managing conflicts of interest in relation to public officials that were elected or politically appointed.

52. Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Czechia, El Salvador, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia and the United States underlined that other categories of officials, including judges and prosecutors, were also subject to conflict of interest management laws.

53. Bosnia and Herzegovina stated that its Law on Conflict of Interest in Governmental Institutions defined specific additional requirements for elected officials, executive office holders and advisers in the public institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina in exercising their duty.

54. Bosnia and Herzegovina, El Salvador, Italy, Montenegro, Norway, Peru and Poland highlighted that other administrative staff, including public officials who were engaged through employment or consultancy contracts, must also abide by the laws on conflict of interest.

55. Algeria, Italy and Turkey reported that their public procurement legislation contained special rules to prevent and manage conflicts of interest for the officials involved in public procurement processes.

56. Italy reported that its legislation regulates the conflicts of interest of three groups of officials: the public administration, the judiciary, and members of Parliament and of the Government. Codes of conduct had been adopted to regulate the outside activities of these groups of officials.

C. Institutional framework

57. The implementation of conflict of interest legislation is a critical component of the conflict of interest management regime. A central issue in that regard is the institutional framework that is established to enforce the relevant legislation. This issue was addressed by all States parties in their submissions.

58. States parties reported employing two different approaches in establishing the institutional framework for preventing and managing conflicts of interest. Some States parties highlighted that they had established specialized institutions tasked with overseeing asset and interest disclosure, providing ethics advice and enforcing the specialized conflict of interest legislation. In contrast, other States parties reported having established a system in which the management of conflicts of interest was carried out by the managers and supervisors in public institutions as a part of their regular functions.

59. The management of conflicts of interest was often seen as part of the prevention of corruption which led to a decision to entrust an anti-corruption body with conflict of interest management functions. This was most often the case in countries where specific anti-corruption and conflict of interest laws had been adopted.

60. Argentina stated that its anti-corruption body oversaw the implementation of the conflict of interest legislation and the related interest disclosure system. Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Romania, Slovenia and Poland reported that their anti-corruption bodies were responsible for the implementation of conflict of interest legislation.

61. Panama reported that its National Authority of Transparency and Access to Information was the central body tasked with prevention of conflicts of interest. Czechia reported that the unit for combating corruption of the Ministry of Justice dealt with the issue of conflicts of interest as part of its other activities.

62. Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Czechia and Turkey reported that specialized bodies which were part of the executive branch enforced the conflict of interest legislation.

63. Slovenia reported that the main body responsible for managing conflicts of interest, incompatibilities of functions and restrictions on operations was the Commission for the Prevention of Corruption. The Commission was an independent body mandated to prevent and investigate corruption and breaches of ethics and to promote integrity in public office. Once it had been determined that there was a possibility that a conflict of interest had arisen in the official conduct of officials, the Commission might initiate a procedure to determine the actual existence of the conflict of interest. If it was established that a conflict of interest existed, the Commission would inform the competent authority or the employer and set the deadline by which they were obliged to inform the Commission of the measures they had taken.

64. Indonesia indicated that the supervision of the implementation of the conflict of interest regime was carried out through the existing governmental internal control system. The conflict of interest legislation law also provided for the establishment of specialized ethics commissions in institutions to oversee its implementation.

65. Armenia reported that the bodies responsible for preventing conflicts of interest were the autonomous Commission for the Prevention of Corruption and sectoral ethics commissions, as well as integrity officers within each public agency. Lithuania stated that the Chief Official Ethics Commission exercised functions related to the supervision of persons employed in the civil service and persons carrying out lobbying activities.

66. Other States parties opted for a fully decentralized system of managing conflicts of interest, with no central body in charge of the process. Armenia, Austria, Chile, Georgia, Hungary, Italy, Indonesia, Kiribati, the Russian Federation, Slovenia and Turkey reported that they had introduced a decentralized system in which the management of conflicts of interest was mainstreamed into the day-to-day management practices of public institutions.

D. Conflict of interest guidance and training

67. The tools and procedures used to avoid or manage conflicts of interest so as to avoid harming the public interest were highlighted by many States, which referred to a number of different approaches.

68. Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Georgia, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Romania, Singapore, Slovenia and Turkey reported that they actively promoted integrity in the public sector by providing training programmes on conflicts of interest.

69. Internal training programmes were complemented by awareness-raising activities for external stakeholders in Argentina, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Romania and Slovenia.

70. Norway stated that the ministry in charge of promoting trust and preventing conflicts of interest in the public administration had issued guidelines on gifts in the public administration that provide guidance for public officials as to whether a gift might be acceptable.

71. The United States reported that, within three months from the time an employee started work for a federal agency, the agency provided the employee with initial ethics training. The initial training programme focused on ethics laws and regulations that the designated agency ethics official deemed appropriate for the audience and addressed concepts related to financial conflicts of interest, impartiality, misuse of position and gifts. Senior agency officials who were serving in presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed positions received counselling on the application of the federal conflict of interest laws prior to appointment and in conjunction with the preparation and submission of their first public financial disclosure report for the purpose of their nomination and appointment.

72. Argentina highlighted that, in order to promote awareness among public officials on potential situations of conflict of interest, a "conflict of interest simulator" had been developed and was available on the website of the Anti-Corruption Office. A public official could complete a questionnaire to detect any possible violation of the conflict of interest rules, and the simulator would then suggest a conflict of interest management strategy.

73. Belgium noted that it had developed a manual for public officials on conflict of interest management.

E. Measures to prevent conflicts of interest

74. Many States referred to measures that were put in place to prevent conflicts of interest from arising.

75. Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Czechia, Georgia, Indonesia, Italy, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and

Slovenia reported that they used the concept of incompatibilities of function to avoid conflicts of interest. That approach consisted of the prohibition of public officials simultaneously carrying out their public functions alongside certain private capacities, including, but not limited to, political activities, business activities or external employment.

76. Italy noted its incompatibility restrictions for public officials, who were prohibited from simultaneously holding multiple positions in the public administration, as elected or appointed officials, as well as from holding positions in international and foreign institutions.

77. Montenegro stated that public officials were not allowed to simultaneously exercise managerial or any other functions in companies, including State-owned enterprises and public institutions, and were required to resign from their outside positions before taking public office. The conflict of interest regime further included measures to limit remuneration for participation in multiple bodies or commissions, as well as a prohibition on making decisions in a situation of conflict of interest.

78. Georgia reported that public officials were restricted from performing any kind of paid work (except for scientific, teaching or creative activities) or holding another position in any public institution or a private company. Public officials could not be assigned to supervise an organization in which a family member was employed.

79. Norway reported that, under the Ethical Guidelines for the Public Service, public officials were not allowed to occupy other positions or assignments or to own financial instruments that were incompatible with their primary function or that might impair trust in public administration.

80. Algeria reported that officials involved in procurement submitted declarations disclosing whether they were in a situation of conflict of interest and, where there was such a conflict, had to recuse themselves from participation in the procedure. In case of a failure to disclose a conflict of interest, where the official had taken part in the deliberation procedures, the procurement decision would be considered null and void.

81. In Norway, public officials were prohibited from accepting gifts and hospitality that might influence their tasks as civil servants. Civil servants were also restricted from offering gifts and other benefits that might influence the receiver. The Ethical Guidelines for the Public Service also promoted openness about gifts and outside activities. Equivalent rules on outside positions and gifts applied to members of government and other political appointees.

82. Czechia, Georgia, Italy, Montenegro, Norway, Romania, Slovenia, Switzerland and Turkey reported that their conflict of interest legislation also included post-employment restrictions concerning former public officials.

83. Georgia provided information that a public servant was not allowed, within one year following separation, to work in a public institution, or carry out activities in an enterprise which had been under his or her official supervision during the past three years. During that one-year period, the former public servant was not allowed to receive income from such a public institution or enterprise.

84. Montenegro reported that for a period of two years following the termination of a public function, a public official was not allowed to enter into a contract or other form of business interaction with the authority in which he or she had exercised a public function. The person was also prohibited from acting before the same authority as a representative or attorney of a legal person or entrepreneur.

85. Italy stated that employees who in the last three years of service had exercised authoritative and negotiating power on behalf of the public administration were not allowed to take up professional activities in the same area during the three years following the cessation of public employment. Any contracts concluded in violation of the post-employment prohibition were void and the companies that had concluded

them were disqualified from participating in procurement tenders for the following three years. Any monies paid under such contracts were due for recovery.

86. Norway also indicated that post-employment restrictions were regulated by law. According to these rules, politicians and public officials in leading positions that were taking up employment outside the public administration or establishing a private business might be subject to a "cooling-off" period.

87. Singapore stated that public officers in certain designated posts were not allowed, for a specified period of time after leaving public service, to take up employment with any person or organization with which he had direct and significant dealings.

F. Disclosure of conflict of interest

88. States parties emphasized the importance of putting in place effective systems for the disclosure and declaration of conflicts of interest. Transparency mechanisms that ensured that outside private interests did not influence the decisions of the public official were an important and powerful corruption prevention tool. Such mechanisms not only informed the public of the potential linkages and dependencies of the public officials but also facilitated the detection of corruption and further investigation.

89. Approaches to the disclosure of conflicts of interest differ, with two general trends identifiable in the submissions. In implementing article 8, paragraph 5, of the Convention, many States parties reported that they had put in place official paper-based or electronic systems requiring public officials to declare their assets, liabilities and business and sometimes even private interests such as links to officials or business people.

90. Thus, most of the submissions indicated that the systems that allowed for declarations of situations of conflict of interest were part of broader systems on asset disclosure. These systems are addressed in detail in the background paper on asset and interest disclosure systems (CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/3).

91. A number of countries indicated that the institutionalized system of regular submission of asset and interest declarations was often complemented by a requirement that public officials disclose, on an ad hoc basis, situations in which their private interest might influence the independent and professional discharge of their functions.

92. Armenia reported that public officials must disclose potential conflicts of interest to their supervisors on an ad hoc basis. Hungary stated that public officials were required to disclose a potential conflict of interest to their supervisor and relinquish their private interest or face dismissal.

93. Italy reported that when a conflict of interest arose, public officials were required to disclose it immediately and recuse themselves from decision-making. The code of conduct of public officers provided that the official had to inform the head of the office of all business relationships, whether direct or indirect, paid or unpaid, undertaken during the last three years. This information must also be provided for the relatives of the public officer.

94. Montenegro reported that, in addition to the mandatory annual declaration of assets and interests, ad hoc disclosure of conflicts of interest was required.

95. Singapore stated that all public officers were required to declare, on an ad hoc basis, any potential conflicts of interest, whether real or perceived, between their official duties and private interests, in addition to submitting regular declarations.

96. Slovenia reported that any official person who, upon taking up a post or office or during the performance of the duties of the post or office, found that a conflict of interest had arisen or might arise, had to immediately declare their private interest. The rules governing the ad hoc disclosure of interests were stipulated in procedural

legislation such as the Administrative Procedure Act, the Criminal Procedure Act, the Labour Act and the Public Procurement Act. The ad hoc interest declaration rules applied to both elected and appointed officials, senior public officials, other public officials and civil servants as well as managers, members of management and supervisory boards, and employees of state-owned enterprises. The preliminary declarations of interests were collected and maintained by the Commission for the Prevention of Corruption. The ad hoc declarations were stored by the body or organization responsible for carrying out the official task to which the situation of conflict of interest related. Such declarations could be accessed under the system of free access to information. The law also defined fines for failure to comply with the above-mentioned provisions.

97. Many countries, including Austria, Chile, Czechia, Hungary, Italy, Kiribati, Montenegro, Norway, Peru and Romania underlined the importance for the conflict of interest disclosure regime of ensuring the widest possible measure of transparency.

98. Romania reported that the National Integrity Agency had developed a system to prevent and detect conflicts of interest in relation to public procurement, by automatically detecting whether participants in the public bid were relatives of or otherwise connected to people from the contracting institution's management. The system aimed to strengthen accountability among the heads of public authorities and to avoid situations in which European Union-financed projects were blocked due to suspicions of fraud.

99. Austria indicated that an independent online platform created by civil society provided information on parliamentarians and top-level politicians. The information gathered and published on the platform included the educational background, secondary employment and outside activities of the politicians.

III. Conclusions and recommendations

100. States are encouraged to provide further relevant updates and present new initiatives to the Working Group in order to continue and enhance the process of mutual learning.

101. On the basis of the information summarized in this report and the information to be presented at its ninth meeting, the Working Group may wish to give an overall appraisal of progress made so far in relation to preventing and managing conflicts of interest.

102. The Working Group may also wish to encourage States to prioritize conflict of interest management initiatives and to support each other in the development and implementation of such initiatives, including through the exchange of good practices and experiences, particularly in the light of the challenges and technical assistance needs that were reported.

103. The Working Group may wish to request UNODC to continue its efforts to gather information on good practices by States on the implementation of article 7, paragraph 4, of the Convention. Subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources, UNODC should support States parties in the implementation of the relevant articles of the Convention through the development of training material and the organization of workshops, meetings and other events.

United Nations CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/3

Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Distr.: General
21 June 2018

Original: English

Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption
Vienna, 5–7 September 2018
Item 2 (b) of the provisional agenda*
Implementation of Conference resolutions 7/5, entitled "Promoting preventive measures against corruption", and 7/6, entitled "Follow-up to the Marrakech declaration on the prevention of corruption": thematic discussion on asset and interest disclosure systems (article 8, paragraph 5, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption)

Asset and interest disclosure systems (article 8, paragraph 5, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption)

Background paper prepared by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 6/1, the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption requested the Secretariat to structure the provisional agendas of the subsidiary bodies established by the Conference in such a way as to avoid duplication of discussions, while respecting their mandates. The Conference further requested the Secretariat, in its resolution 6/6, to continue to identify comparative good practices on measures to prevent corruption and to facilitate the exchange of expertise and lessons learned among States parties.

2. In its resolution 7/6, entitled "Follow-up to the Marrakech declaration on the prevention of corruption", the Conference decided that the Working Group should continue its work to advise and assist the Conference in the implementation of its mandate on the prevention of corruption and should hold at least two meetings prior to the eighth session of the Conference.

3. In its resolution 7/5, entitled "Promoting preventive measures against corruption", the Conference decided that the Working Group should include as the topic for 2018 the use and effectiveness of asset declaration systems and conflicts of interest.

* CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/1/Rev.1

V.18-04202 (E) 270618 280618

Please recycle

4. In the light of these resolutions, it was decided that the topics for discussion at the ninth intersessional meeting of the Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption, to be held in Vienna from 5 to 7 September 2018, would be:

(a) Preventing and managing conflicts of interest (art. 7, para. 4);

(b) Asset and interest disclosure systems (art. 8, para. 5).

5. At its second meeting, held in Vienna from 22 to 24 August 2011, the Working Group recommended that in advance of each of its future meetings, States parties should be invited to share their experiences of implementing the provisions under consideration, preferably by using the self-assessment checklist and including, where possible, successes, challenges, technical assistance needs and lessons learned in implementation. The Working Group requested the Secretariat to prepare background papers synthesizing that information and decided that panel discussions should be held during its meetings, involving experts from countries that had provided written responses on the priority themes under consideration.

6. In accordance with these requests, the present report has been prepared on the basis of information relating to the implementation of article 8, paragraph 5, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption provided by Governments in response to the Secretary-General's note verbale dated 27 February 2018 and the reminder note verbale dated 26 April 2018.[1] As of 18 June 2018, submissions had been received from 44 States. The submissions from the following 39 countries contained information relating to the topic of conflict of interest: Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, China, Cuba, Czechia, Egypt, El Salvador, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lithuania, Montenegro, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States of America.

7. With the agreement of the countries concerned, the full text of the submissions has been made available on the website of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)[2] and incorporated into the thematic website developed by the Secretariat.[3]

8. The present report does not purport to be comprehensive but, rather, endeavours to provide a summary of the information submitted by States parties and signatories.

II. Analysis of submissions of States parties and signatories

A. Thematic background

9. The requirement for public officials to disclose their assets and interests is a relatively modern trend. While it was initially thought to be a violation of the right to privacy, the approach to asset and interest disclosure has been changing gradually, influenced by decisions of international human rights bodies and growing concerns for integrity in public administration.

10. Most of the modern asset and interest disclosure systems were developed following the adoption of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, in response to the requirements of article 8 of the Convention.

11. Article 8, paragraph 5, of the Convention requires States parties to endeavour, where appropriate and in accordance with the fundamental principles of their domestic law, to establish measures and systems requiring public officials to make

[1] A summary of information submitted by States relating to preventing and managing conflicts of interest in the context of article 7, paragraph 4, of the Convention was provided in a separate background paper prepared by the Secretariat (CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/2).

[2] Available at www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/WG-Prevention/session9.html.

[3] Available at www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/WG-Prevention/financial-disclosure-declaration-of-assets.html.

declarations to appropriate authorities regarding, inter alia, their outside activities, employment, investments, assets and substantial gifts or benefits from which a conflict of interest may result with respect to their functions as public officials.

12. The purpose of an asset and interest disclosure regime is therefore to avoid potential conflicts of interest in the future and to facilitate the management of such conflicts, where appropriate. Many systems also seek to ensure that corrupt public officials will not be able to conceal the proceeds of any illegal activity.

13. The goal of the asset declaration system to ensure that the proceeds of corruption will not be concealed was particularly relevant for countries that have introduced in their criminal legislation the offence of "illicit enrichment", in accordance with article 20 of the Convention. In those cases, asset disclosure may become an effective tool to support enforcement of that legislation.

14. The need to introduce asset disclosure systems has been underlined in several resolutions of the Conference of the States Parties. In its resolution 7/5, the Conference encouraged States to adopt, maintain and strengthen systems that promote transparency and prevent conflict of interests. In its resolution 6/3, entitled "Fostering effective asset recovery", and its resolution 7/2, entitled "Preventing and combating corruption in all its forms more effectively, including, among others, when it involves vast quantities of assets, based on a comprehensive and multidisciplinary approach, in accordance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption", the Conference called on States parties to consider establishing effective financial disclosure systems for appropriate public officials.

15. The importance of article 8, paragraph 5, of the Convention has already been noted by the Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption, which had discussed implementation of that paragraph at its third intersessional meeting, in 2012.[4]

B. Measures adopted by States to introduce asset and interest systems

1. Goal of the asset disclosure system

16. The different legal traditions, legislation and policy priorities of States parties were reflected in the submissions received, and States therefore described a variety of systems, which focused on different levels of public officials and different disclosure requirements.

17. States have developed income and interest declaration systems that fall into three broad categories: systems aimed solely at managing conflicts of interest, systems designed to identify an inexplicable increase of wealth of public officials, and dual-purpose systems that aim to achieve both of the above-mentioned purposes. The most frequently reported approach in the submissions of States was the dual-purpose system.

18. Further, some States also outlined how asset and interest declaration systems were used to promote transparency or to help auditing and law enforcement agencies to detect corruption.

19. Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Georgia, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Lithuania, Madagascar, Montenegro, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia and the United States provided descriptions of the objectives of the declaration system applicable to their public officials.

20. Algeria reported that the goal of its asset interest disclosure regime was to guarantee the integrity of the political and administrative processes in the country, to

[4] See the note by the Secretariat on conflicts of interest, reporting acts of corruption and asset declarations, particularly in the context of articles 7–9 of the Convention (CAC/COSP/WG.4/2012/3).

protect the dignity of the persons involved in public life, and to increase public confidence in the integrity of the Government.

21. Romania reported that its interest disclosure system served both to ensure transparency in the exercise of a public office and to identify potential incompatibilities and conflicts of interest.

22. The Plurinational State of Bolivia stated that the purpose of its system of declarations of assets and income was to identify possible cases of illicit enrichment.

23. Georgia, Lithuania, Romania and the United States reported that the primary purpose of their financial disclosure systems was to assist agencies in identifying and eliminating potential conflicts of interest between a filer's official duties and his or her private financial interests and affiliations.

24. Indonesia underlined that the main goal of its system was to serve as an early warning tool to help with anti-corruption investigations, to promote transparency and integrity and to serve as a source of information for asset tracking and forfeiture.

25. Peru noted that the goal of its asset disclosure legislation was to implement effective oversight mechanisms in relation to the assets and income of public servants and officials as a means of preventing corruption.

26. The Russian Federation highlighted that the asset disclosure regime was one of the most important elements of its corruption prevention framework. In addition, public officials were prohibited from acquiring and maintaining assets, including foreign bank accounts and foreign financial instruments abroad.

2. Categories of individuals needing to make asset and interest declarations

27. One of the key elements for the asset and interest disclosure regime was the scope of persons required to disclose. That decision was shaped by the purpose of the asset and interest disclosure system, by the level of resources available to administer and manage the system and by other design factors such as whether the system was paper-based or electronic, and the approach to be taken to verifications. The decision as to scope was important as it largely predetermined the ability of the State party to manage the system that it had developed. A second, related decision was whether the assets and interests of family members and other individuals should be reflected in the declaration.

28. The variety of approaches was illustrated by the wide array of options presented by the States parties. Nonetheless, the following three groups of approaches could be identified in the submissions: systems which focused entirely on the high-level public officials (including those elected or politically appointed); systems which also required lower-level civil servants to declare; and systems which, in addition to these two groups, also provided for the disclosure of the assets and interests of managers of State-owned companies.

29. Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Czechia, Hungary, Indonesia, Lithuania, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone and the United States required high-level elected officials such as the Head of State, members of Parliament and/or ministers to declare their assets and interests.

30. Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cyprus, Czechia, Georgia, Hungary, Kiribati, Lithuania, Madagascar, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia and the United States reported that they required family members or members of public officials' households to report on their assets and interests.

31. Algeria stated that the focus of the asset and interest disclosure regime was on high-level officials, including the President, members of Parliament, members of local assemblies, magistrates, members of the Constitutional Council, the Prime Minister and ministers, the president of the supreme audit institution, the Central

Bank and ambassadors. Property belonging to the adolescent children of such public officials should also be declared.

32. Armenia noted that officials holding State (high-level) positions such as the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister, deputies of the National Assembly, members of the Constitutional Court, judges, ministers and their deputies, prosecutors, heads of agencies, their advisers and assistants, as well as mayors and holders of public service positions, had to submit regular asset and interest declarations.

33. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that elected officials at all levels must submit declarations of their assets to the Central Election Commission. Executive office holders and their advisers had an obligation to disclose their assets and interests to the Commission for Deciding on Conflict of Interest.

34. Cuba highlighted that an asset and interest disclosure system had been put in place for the officials of the customs service and for the officials serving under the Comptroller General of the Republic.

35. Cyprus reported that the President of the Republic, ministers and members of Parliament were obligated to disclose their assets to a parliamentary committee, while the lower level public officials submitted their declarations to a special council established by law. The assets and liabilities of the family members, spouses and children who were minors were also to be disclosed.

36. Georgia reported that it had taken a broad approach to defining the circle of officials who had to submit asset and income declarations and included high-level elected and politically-appointed officials, their assistants, heads of agencies, the Auditor General, members of the board and the president of the Central Bank, judges and prosecutors, local government officials and the heads of State-owned enterprises.

37. Hungary provided information that public officials of the executive branch and the judiciary, members of law enforcement agencies, professional and contracted soldiers of the Hungarian Defence Forces and employees of the Hungarian National Bank had to submit information on their assets and those belonging to their family members.

38. Kiribati reported that politically appointed high-level officials had to submit to the Leadership Code Commission a brief written statement on their assets and liabilities, both in and outside Kiribati, before the end of January every year. Public officials were also required to disclose the assets of their immediate family. The statement included a list of properties owned and their estimated values.

39. Panama reported that the President and the Vice-President of the Republic, judges, the Prosecutor General, ministers, heads of agencies and members of Parliament, as well as lower-level officials were required to file an affidavit of their property status at the beginning and at the end of their functions. To ensure compliance, officials received their salaries only upon submitting the required affidavit.

40. Portugal indicated that an asset and interest disclosure system had been introduced for high-level elected and appointed officials, including the President, ministers, members of Parliament, mayors, general directors of administration and members of the board of directors of State-owned companies.

41. Poland reported that asset declarations had to be submitted by members of the Sejm and senators, civil servants holding managerial positions, judges and public prosecutors, as well as local government officials including councillors. Local government officials were also obligated to submit declarations on their spouses' economic activity that was conducted within the perimeter of the same local government unit in which the local official held office or was employed.

42. Romania underlined that 39 categories of officials had a legal obligation to submit asset and interest declarations, including high-level elected and appointed officials, candidates for high-level positions, judges and prosecutors, local

administration officials, leaders of trade unions, and officials in State-owned enterprises.

43. Sierra Leone stated that all public servants, elected or appointed, had an obligation to deposit a sworn declaration of their income, assets and liabilities, including the assets of their spouse and any children under the age of 21 years.

44. Slovenia highlighted that it took a broad approach to ensuring the submission of asset and interest disclosures forms. All appointed and elected public officials including high-ranking civil servants, managers in public agencies, institutes and State-owned enterprises, persons responsible for public procurement, civil servants of the National Review Commission for Reviewing Public Procurement Award Procedures, and, under certain conditions, citizens of Slovenia who hold office in European Union institutions, other European Union bodies and other international institutions.

45. The United States reported that two systems for financial disclosure had been established: a public financial disclosure system in which senior government employees, including the President, Vice-President, heads of agencies and others were required to file public financial disclosure reports; and a confidential financial disclosure system for lower-level officials appointed to positions with a higher risk of conflicts of interest. For most of these officials, the individual also had to provide the same or similar information for a spouse and dependent children.

3. Reporting scope of the asset and interest disclosure systems

46. The scope of the information requested was also linked to the underlying purpose of the system. In those systems that were focused on identifying conflicts of interest, there was a tendency to request information on links to interests in both privately and publicly held businesses together with details of activities of the public official outside of their employment. In contrast, when the purpose of the system was to identify illicit enrichment, the information requested tended to focus on assets of value, sources of income and, in some cases, expenditures. The detail and specifics of the information requested varied significantly from State party to State party.

47. Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cuba, Czechia, Georgia, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Madagascar, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia and the United States reported that their systems covered the disclosure of the assets, liabilities and interests of public officials.

48. Bosnia and Herzegovina stated that elected officials had to disclose their current income and movable and immovable property that they owned, in the country and abroad, as well as their liabilities.

49. Lithuania highlighted that the declarations on conflicts of interest had to contain information on all legal persons linked to the official in any way, individual economic activity, membership and position in undertakings, establishments, associations or foundations, gifts and large transactions, as well as a list of any persons, or information that might give rise to a conflict of interest.

50. Cyprus reported that public officials were required to submit information on every asset, movable and immovable, in Cyprus or abroad, on their liabilities and debts and on their bank accounts.

51. Armenia stated that the asset declaration contained information related to the official's property (movable and immovable property, securities and other investments and loans), as well as his or her income. The definition of income was very broad and included remuneration for work or any other equivalent payment, royalties, interest and other compensation on received or given loans, profits, income received in games in casinos or lotteries, in-kind or monetary gains in competitions or contests, property and monetary assets received as a donation or aid, inherited property, insurance compensation, income received from entrepreneurship, income

received from alienation of property, payment or other compensation for lease income from civil law contracts, lump-sum payments, and income received from proprietary rights, whether received in monetary or non-monetary forms.

52. Norway reported that a public declaration system for members of Parliament included information on accessory posts and activities, on real estate of considerable value or used for business purposes, business interests such as shares, gifts and travel abroad, as well as gifts or financial benefits of a value of more than 2,000 Norwegian krone (roughly 200 euros). The name of the donor, the nature of the benefit and the date when it was given were to be indicated in the declaration.

53. Poland reported that asset declarations contained information on personal finances, immovable property, shares and stocks in companies, and property purchased by the declaring person or their spouse from the State Treasury, other State-owned legal persons, local government units, their associations or a metropolitan association or property which was disposed of by tender. The declaration also contained details on economic activity and the functions held in the companies or cooperatives.

54. Sierra Leone reported that the information that was required to be disclosed included assets, liabilities, cash held in banks, cash in hand, outside financial interests, the names of the official's spouse and children under the age of 21 years and their assets, and the mode and source of financing used to acquire the assets declared.

55. The United States indicated that the public financial disclosure reports included information on sources of earned income and their amounts, liabilities, positions held outside of government, continuing arrangement with a former or current employer, or any arrangement for future employment. Officials were also required to disclose their beneficial interests in trusts and other financial arrangements, such as private equity funds unless exempt from doing so. Additionally, employees in positions requiring public financial disclosures had to file periodic transaction reports of certain personal financial transactions in stocks, bonds and other securities.

56. Romania reported that public officials had to submit information on their real estate, vehicles, precious metals, jewellery and art, bank accounts, cash, investments, direct investments and loans, as well as debts, mortgages and guaranteed leases. The disclosure also included information on the official's stake or shares in companies, credit institutions, economic interest groups, membership in associations, foundations or other non-governmental organizations, membership in governing, management and control bodies of companies, national investment companies, credit institutions, economic interest groups, associations or foundations or other non-governmental organizations, membership in professional associations or trade unions, membership in governing, management and control bodies of political parties, whether remunerated or unpaid, contracts, including legal assistance, legal advice, consulting and service contracts, completed or in progress during office, guarantees or significant public funding received from the State budget, local and foreign funds, and agreements with companies with State capital or in which the State was a majority or minority shareholder.

57. The Russian Federation highlighted that all high-level public officials had to submit information on their income and expenses and on all of their assets and liabilities, as well as the assets and liabilities of their family members.

58. Singapore reported that all public officers were required to make annual declarations of interests in investments and properties to the head of their agency, including investments and properties owned by their spouse and financially dependent children.

59. Slovakia noted that all public officials had to declare their interests and submit a declaration of offices, employment positions, activities and economic standing, including their ownership of immovable and movable property, as well as debts and liabilities.

C. Submission of the asset and interest declarations

1. Frequency of submission

60. The most frequently reported approach was that public servants and officials were required to submit asset declarations at the time they began their public service, annually during the time they were in office, and once again after the termination of their employment in public office. The other approach reported by States was that declarants had to report when certain significant events occurred, such as a significant increase or decrease in assets held.

61. No correlation was observed between the frequency of the submission of declarations and the purpose of the system. Some States reported that the frequency of submission was linked to either the seniority or the position of the declarant.

62. Argentina, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, Georgia, Hungary, Italy, Madagascar, Montenegro, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia and the United States reported that declarations were submitted on both commencing and terminating service, as well as annually during the employment.

63. Panama and Portugal indicated that declarations of elected officials were submitted upon the election and on the expiration of the mandate of the elected official.

64. Hungary stated that all officials had to submit an asset declaration prior to the appointment to a position that required the declaration, within 15 days after the termination of such employment, and periodically during the period of employment. The frequency of those periodic reports varied depending on the type of job or position.

65. Madagascar and Sierra Leone reported that all public officials had an obligation to deposit an asset declaration within three months of appointment.

66. Algeria stated that public officials were required to submit a declaration on assuming their position, after leaving the position, and whenever there was a substantial change in their property. Similarly, Lithuania reported that the declaration of interests should be submitted by public officials upon election or appointment and be modified on an ad hoc basis, whenever changes occurred or a conflict of interest arose.

67. The United States reported that individuals in positions that required public financial disclosure filed their declarations upon entry into the position, annually, and then upon leaving the position. Certain individuals, such as candidates for nomination or election to the office of the President or Vice-President, and certain presidential nominees requiring Senate confirmation, had to file their disclosure within a period of time but no later than 30 days before an election or within five days after nomination to a position. New entrants were required to file a report within 30 days of assuming office, if not earlier. Thereafter, the officials had to file an annual report every year by May 15, and again within 30 days of terminating their position. The United States also reported that certain employees who were less senior but whose positions posed a risk of potential conflicts of interest were required to file new disclosure reports upon assuming office, as well as annual confidential financial disclosure reports, but they were not required to submit termination reports.

2. Method of submission

68. In relation to the method of submission of asset and interest disclosure reports, three clear variants were reported: States parties that accepted electronic submissions only, those that accepted paper-based submissions only, and those that accepted both paper-based and electronic submissions. Some States that reported that they could receive either paper-based or electronic submissions gave the declarant the option of which format to use. Other States reported that paper-based systems were required for some categories of officials.

69. Cuba, Cyprus, Sierra Leone and Slovenia indicated that their asset and income disclosure systems were paper-based.

70. Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Czechia, Georgia, Indonesia, Italy, Lithuania and the United States reported using electronic systems for the submission of declarations.

71. Hungary, Madagascar, Montenegro and Romania reported that the asset and interest declarations could be submitted electronically online or in paper format, depending on the position of the declaring public official.

72. Armenia stated that the Commission on Ethics of High-Ranking Officials maintained an electronic declaration platform enabling the online submission of asset declarations.

73. The Plurinational State of Bolivia reported that a system for online submission of the declarations of property and income before the Office of the Comptroller General of the State had been established. Public officials were able to access their account at any time to register, modify and print their declaration of property and assets.

74. The United States reported that an executive branch-wide electronic filing system was available for the filing of public reports, while the confidential filing was done either through individual agencies' electronic filing systems or by using standard forms which were available on the website of the Office of Government Ethics. Agencies could also seek permission from the Office of Government Ethics to use a more tailored, alternative confidential form.

75. Sierra Leone reported that declarations were submitted on paper and had to be signed on oath by the declarant in the presence of a Commissioner for Oaths or a justice of the peace. Sierra Leone further noted that it was planning to establish an online asset declaration system which would facilitate the completion and submission of asset declarations.

3. Competent body

76. In general, States parties reported two distinct types of system, with the public officials being required to submit their declarations either to the agency that employed them or to a central agency that was responsible for the collection of asset and interest declarations. There were a variety of central agencies which performed this role, including supreme audit institutions, anti-corruption bodies and tax authorities. Additionally, some States parties reported having separate systems for certain categories of officials such as the judiciary or elected representatives.

77. Algeria reported that the competent body to which declarations were submitted depended on the rank of the declaring officials. The Supreme Court was responsible for collecting the declarations of the President, members of Parliament, the Prime Minister, ministers and other high-level officials, whereas the national body for prevention of corruption was responsible for collecting declarations of lower-level officials.

78. Armenia and Lithuania reported that the declarations were submitted to a central body responsible for public sector ethics, while Austria stated that the reports of public servants were sent to the Auditor General's Office.

79. The United States reported that the public financial disclosure reports were submitted to the Office of Government Ethics, through an online platform that was administrated by the Office as well as to the individual government agencies in which the officials worked.

80. The Plurinational State of Bolivia reported that the Office of the Comptroller General of the State, as the governing body of the government control system, exercised the power to direct and control the declaration of assets and income system for all of the public sector. It was also responsible for establishing the regulations related to the system of declarations of goods and rents.

81. Germany reported that civil servants were generally not required to disclose their assets after being appointed or elected. To compensate for the lack of an asset and interest disclosure system, the revenue authorities were obliged to report any facts which give rise to a reason to suspect a criminal offence to the law enforcement authorities.

82. Indonesia stated that all public officials of the executive, legislative and judicial branches with strategic functions had to submit asset and interest declarations to the Corruption Eradication Commission. In contrast, lower level civil servants submitted reports on their assets to the head of the respective government agency.

83. Madagascar reported that the Independent Anti-Corruption Bureau was responsible for the management of the declarations of assets and economic interests. It was competent for the collection, verification, operation, control, monitoring, archiving and securing of information, as well as for the implementation of sanctions for default and misrepresentation.

84. Hungary stated that declarations were submitted to the employer of the public official or bailiff, the county chamber of notaries, the owner of the State-owned company, the manager of the State subvention fund or the president of the Hungarian Central Bank.

85. Portugal stated that the holders of political offices and high-level officials submitted regular declarations to the Constitutional Court. Slovakia noted that it had established a decentralized system of asset and interest disclosure, under which high-level officials had to submit a declaration to their supervising bodies.

4. Measures to support the submission of declarations

86. The practical requirements for the implementation of the asset and interest disclosure regime often presented challenges for public officials. Therefore, a number of States parties also reported taking specific measures to facilitate the submission process, to build the capacity of public officials and the oversight bodies entrusted with the management of the asset disclosure system, and to raise the awareness of public officials and the public at large of the importance of the disclosure.

87. The most common type of support that was reported was the availability of guidance on the completion of the declaration in either paper format or on the website in cases where electronic submissions were possible. Some States parties also highlighted that they maintained help desk facilities to provide advice to officials filing declarations.

88. Czechia, Hungary, Romania and Slovenia stated that they had adopted special guidelines to facilitate the submission of the declarations by public officials. The Plurinational State of Bolivia reported that guidelines for filing the asset declarations were available on the website of the General Comptroller of the State.

89. Chile underlined that the human resources subdepartment provided personalized advice to public officials, in person or online.

90. Hungary reported that a guidance note was attached as an annex to the declaration template and that human resources units of the different State organizations helped facilitate the completion of declarations of the assets.

91. Indonesia reported that it provided video tutorials on the relevant website to guide public officials when submitting declarations. The United States stated that the Office of Government Ethics had created an interactive online public financial disclosure guide to assist those who file or review public financial disclosure reports. The guide provided step-by-step instructions on how to fill out the public financial disclosure form and how to report specific types of financial holdings.

D. Verification and enforcement

92. The submissions by States parties addressed two key aspects of the verification process: the criteria used to decide which declarations to verify and the verification process itself.

1. Declarations subjected to verification

93. Three trends were identified in the submissions with regard to the criteria used to select which asset and interest declarations would be subject to verification.

94. Montenegro reported that, under its system, all declarations submitted by high-level officials were subjected to verification.

95. Georgia, Montenegro, Sierra Leone and Slovenia reported using a different method in which a random sample of declarations was selected for verification.

96. The third approach that was adopted by States based the decision to verify on the detection of risks. Argentina, Cuba, Czechia, Georgia, Indonesia and Romania indicated that the decision to perform a verification was taken following the receipt of a corruption-related complaint against a public official. Indonesia also reported that a decision to perform a verification of an asset declaration could also be based on whether a red flag or anomalies were detected.

2. Verification procedures

97. The two main methods of verification that were reported were electronic checks that were undertaken against other databases of relevant information and the manual examination of the declarations. Many States parties reported that they used both electronic and manual verification techniques.

98. In some cases where electronic techniques were used, they served the purpose of identifying high-risk submissions which would then be subjected to manual verification. In other cases, such as in those States which compared the information included in the declaration to other governmental databases, the electronic verification constituted the complete process.

99. In most instances, States parties reported that the verification was undertaken by the agency tasked with receiving the declaration, but examples were provided where the verification process was undertaken by a separate body, such as the tax authority.

100. Armenia provided information that its electronic declaration system performed automated verifications of all the declarations in the system, as well as the analysis of existing data. The verification process included compliance checking, checking for internal consistency, cross-checks with external databases, comparisons across years, mathematical analysis of declared data, and declaration analysis based on risk indicators. In the process of analysing declarations, the Commission demanded and received the information required from State and local self-government bodies, the central depository and other persons.

101. Argentina indicated that a system was being established which would allow for the integration of all the actors (Anti-Corruption Office, human resources officers and those required to submit) and eliminate all paper-based formats, thus reducing the costs for both the administration and the public officials. The system would also improve the interoperability of data, the possibilities of compiling statistics, the generation of reports and general enforcement.

102. Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Romania reported that the verification of the declarations was performed through cross-checking with external databases of both public and private entities.

103. Czechia, Georgia and Montenegro indicated that the verification process was performed through cross-checking with databases within the public administration.

104. Italy stated that the National Anti-Corruption Authority controlled asset declarations through requests made for information and documentation to the public entities. Slovenia indicated that the Commission for the Prevention of Corruption had access to all information referred to in the declaration of assets and compared that information with official records to verify the accuracy of the statements of the person with obligations.

105. Poland reported that the relevant committees, designated by the Sejm and senate according to their rules, as well as the relevant tax offices, analysed the data in the asset declarations of the members of the Sejm and the senate. The data were compared with the contents of previous declarations and with a copy of the annual tax return. The outcome of the analysis was presented to the Presidium of the Sejm or senate. The Central Anti-Corruption Bureau could also analyse each asset declaration.

106. The United States stated that reviewers were generally proactive in engaging with filers to ensure that all disclosures had been accurately made. This was particularly true for the review of reports under the jurisdiction of the Office of Government Ethics. During the technical review, the relevant agency worked with the individual filer, asking a variety of questions to clarify the entries on the report and helping the individual to ensure that all required information was properly disclosed, which could take multiple rounds. The agency also consulted the publicly available resources such as finance websites, search engines, and government websites to better understand the nature of the individual's financial holdings. If inaccuracies were found, the agency and the Office were authorized to require additional information to be provided by the filer, which became part of the report. Once the review was completed, the reviewing officials within each agency or the Office certified and maintained the reports for a period of six years.

3. Enforcement

107. States parties provided information on enforcement processes relating to the failure to file declarations and the falsification of declarations, including by omission. A broad range of different administrative and criminal sanctions was reported. The most frequently reported sanctions for failure to submit were fines, reductions in salary and dismissal from service. In relation to the submission of false statements, there was a wider variety of sanctions reported, with some States parties having the option of a custodial sentence in serious cases.

108. The Russian Federation and Hungary emphasized that the submission of a declaration was a precondition for the conclusion of the employment contract. Conversely, the failure to submit a declaration constituted grounds for termination of a contract.

109. Armenia reported that its legal regulations provided for administrative sanctions for violations of asset declaration regulations such as late submission, violations of submission requirements and procedures or submission by negligence of wrong or incomplete data in declaration. The regulations further provided for criminal sanctions for the submission of false data, concealing data or the malicious non-submission of declarations.

110. Czechia underlined that whenever the Ministry of Justice concluded that a public official might have committed a misdemeanour, it submitted the information to the Office for Personal Data Protection or a local municipal authority that had an extended jurisdiction for imposing administrative sanctions.

111. Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cyprus and the United States stated that public officials who failed to submit a declaration or submitted a false declaration were criminally liable.

112. Madagascar noted that the breach of the obligation to declare assets constituted a breach of the duty of probity and integrity of public officials, magistrates or military officers.

113. Montenegro reported that, in case of doubt, a public official was required to provide, within 30 days, detailed information on how his or her assets and income had been acquired. Furthermore, the relevant agency forwarded the case to the competent public prosecutor's office. Similarly, Slovakia stated that the body which received declarations requested an explanation from the public official whenever there were doubts concerning their completeness or veracity. If the body deemed the explanation provided to be insufficient, it requested the initiation of proceedings under a special regulation.

114. Romania indicated that an investigation procedure in relation to a conflict of interest or incompatibility was initiated either following an ex officio notification or following a complaint made and consisted of the verification of the interest disclosure by the integrity inspector. If the elements of a conflict of interest or incompatibility were detected, the integrity inspector notified the person under evaluation and asked them to present an explanation. If unexplained wealth was found, the case was forwarded to the Wealth Investigation Commission in the competent Court of Appeal.

115. Slovenia reported that when the Commission for the Prevention of Corruption discovered inconsistencies in a declaration of assets, it requested the official to submit an explanation. If the Commission determined that there had been an unexplained growth of official's assets, it notified the Office of the State Prosecutor to initiate a procedure for the confiscation of the illicit assets.

4. Transparency

116. Transparency of asset and interest disclosure systems is often promoted based on the belief that the access of the general public to the declarations of assets and interests encouraged reporting and facilitated the detection of corruption.

117. The reports from States parties fell into three categories in relation to transparency: all information in the declarations was made public, some information was made public, or no information was made public.

118. In the second category, the restrictions on which information was made public related to either the type of information or the category of the official making the declaration. Typically, in these semi-public systems, any information thought to compromise the security of the official was withheld. In systems where the publication of data was linked to the position of the official, the information was made public or not depending on either the security of certain categories of public officials or whether the information was considered to be in the public interest.

119. Another aspect related to transparency that was highlighted by States was how the information was made public. The information was made available in either electronic or paper format. Further, the information was either proactively made freely available or an individual seeking the information had to apply to obtain it.

120. Argentina, Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Czechia, Georgia, Indonesia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia highlighted that they provided full access to the declarations to the public at large. Bosnia and Herzegovina indicated that the Central Electoral Commission published the declarations of elected officials on its official website. Bosnia and Herzegovina and Romania further stated that information regarding the assets and interest disclosure system was made available on the Internet.

121. Austria, Hungary, Kiribati, Madagascar and Sierra Leone, in contrast, stated that the asset and interest declarations were generally not publicly available.

122. Armenia reported that all information, except for identification data of property and persons, was accessible through an official website. Cyprus stated that the parts of the declarations which contained information on the assets and liabilities of the spouse and the minor children of the public official were kept confidential, while the rest was freely available to the public.

123. The United States underlined that reports submitted by the President, Vice-President and officials at the top two pay levels of the public service, such as cabinet secretaries, were posted online through the Office of Government Ethics' website and could be accessed without the need for a request. All other financial disclosure reports that were available to the public could be requested electronically through the submission of an online request form or, in case of reports filed by executive branch employees, could be obtained by completing a request form with the appropriate agency.

124. Madagascar stated that, to ensure the protection of personal data, the access to the declarations was limited for the purposes of legal proceedings. Statistics relating to the management of the asset declaration system were available and communicated to the public.

III. Conclusions and recommendations

125. The submissions by States ahead of the meeting of the Working Group clearly demonstrated the breadth of approaches and measures that had been taken to strengthen integrity in the public administration by introducing assets and interest disclosure systems. There were similarities across many jurisdictions in terms of goals of the system and its main elements; and important differences and innovative approaches that may be drawn upon by other States parties that were considering such measures.

126. As part of its discussions, the Working Group may wish to consider how States parties can further strengthen their efforts to promote effective, transparent and reliable asset and interest disclosure systems, including sharing information about good practices and common challenges among States parties.

127. The Working Group may also wish to recommend that States parties strengthen the exchange of information on the approaches and measures taken to ensure effective verification of the asset and interest declarations and to strengthen accountability of public officials.

128. The Working Group may wish to request the Secretariat to continue its efforts to gather information on good practices related to the introduction and functioning of asset and interest disclosure systems, particularly in the context of the second implementation review cycle.

United Nations CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/4

Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption

Distr.: General
25 June 2018

Original: English

Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption
Vienna, 5–7 September 2018
Item 2 (b) of the provisional agenda*
Implementation of Conference resolutions 7/5, entitled "Promoting preventive measures against corruption", and 7/6, entitled "Follow-up to the Marrakech declaration on the prevention of corruption": thematic discussion on asset and interest disclosure systems (article 8, paragraph 5, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption)

Status of implementation of Conference resolutions 7/5, entitled "Promoting preventive measures against corruption", and 7/6, entitled "Follow-up to the Marrakech declaration on the prevention of corruption"

Background paper prepared by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 7/5, the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption welcomed the progress made by States parties and the Secretariat in the implementation of its resolutions 5/4 and 6/6, entitled "Follow-up to the Marrakech declaration on the prevention of corruption", and also welcomed the conclusions and recommendations of the meetings of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption held in Vienna from 22 to 24 August 2016 and from 21 to 23 August 2017.[1]

2. In the spirit of maintaining the global effort to prevent corruption, the Conference, at its seventh session, adopted two resolutions focused on the prevention of corruption: resolution 7/5, entitled "Promoting preventive measures against corruption", and resolution 7/6, entitled "Follow-up to the Marrakech declaration on the prevention of corruption". In those resolutions, the Conference requested the Secretariat to submit reports on their implementation to the Conference at its eighth session and to the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption at its intersessional meetings.

3. The present background paper prepared by the Secretariat provides the requested information on the implementation of Conference resolutions 7/5 and 7/6

* CAC/COSP/WG.4/2018/1/Rev.1.

[1] See CAC/COSP/WG.4/2016/5 and CAC/COSP/WG.4/2017/4.

V.18-04326 (E) 040718 050718

Please recycle

and is intended to serve as a basis for the Working Group's discussion of the way forward in the effective prevention of corruption. The paper addresses all initiatives relevant to the implementation of resolutions 7/5 and 7/6 that have been undertaken at the global, regional or national levels by States parties with the support of the Secretariat during the reporting period August 2017–June 2018.

II. Update on the status of implementation of resolutions 7/5 and 7/6

A. Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption

1. Reporting on the implementation of resolutions 7/5 and 7/6 by States parties

4. The Conference, in its resolutions 7/5 and 7/6, called upon States parties to continue and to reinforce the effective implementation of the preventive measures outlined in chapter II of the Convention and in the resolutions of the Conference of the States Parties. States parties are therefore invited to share with the Secretariat any additional information about their activities to implement resolutions 7/5 and 7/6, in particular during the ninth meeting of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption.

2. Reporting on the implementation of chapter II of the Convention

5. In its resolution 7/6, the Conference welcomed the ongoing efforts of the Working Group to facilitate the sharing of information between States parties on their initiatives and good practices relating to the topics considered at past Working Group meetings and decided that the Working Group should continue its work to advise and assist the Conference in the implementation of its mandate. In the same resolution, the Conference welcomed the commitments made and efforts undertaken by States parties to provide information on good practices in preventing corruption that is gathered, systematized and disseminated by the Secretariat in the performance of its functions as an international observatory, requested States parties to continue sharing information, and requested the Secretariat, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources, to continue its work as an international observatory, including by updating the thematic website of the Working Group with relevant information.

6. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) therefore continued to gather information and made all information provided by States parties ahead of each Working Group meeting, as well as presentations made during the meetings, relevant reports and links to further resource material, available on the pages of the UNODC website dedicated to the Working Group (http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/WG-Prevention/working-group-on-prevention.html).

B. Promoting universal adherence to the United Nations Convention against Corruption

New States parties to the Convention

7. UNODC continued to promote the ratification of or accession to the Convention. During the reporting period, Japan, Niue, Samoa and Equatorial Guinea became States parties to the Convention, bringing the number of States parties to 185.

8. During the reporting period, support was provided to Niue through a joint UNODC-United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) workshop held in August 2017 aimed at promoting a deeper understanding of the requirements of the

Convention, as well as through follow-up support leading to the country's accession to the Convention in October 2017.

9. UNODC also supported a pre-ratification workshop held in Chad in February 2018 on the Convention and its requirements.

C. Supporting States' anti-corruption legal and policy frameworks

1. Support to States in drafting laws focused on or including corruption prevention provisions

10. UNODC supported the adoption of various laws addressing aspects of corruption prevention, including by providing assistance in the drafting of legislative amendments and new bills and regulations. The following laws and regulations drafted with the support of UNODC were adopted during 2017: Anti-Corruption Law (Thailand); Supreme Court Regulations on Criminal Corporate Liability (Indonesia); and Anti-Corruption Law (Guinea). Other examples of specific assistance provided are described in the subsections below.

11. Advice in the form of workshops or commentary on draft laws was also provided to 11 countries in regard to 14 bills and regulations that were still pending adoption at the time of writing, including bills on reporting mechanisms and whistle-blower protection (Kenya, Madagascar and Panama), bills on freedom of and access to information (Cambodia, Gambia), a code of conduct for public officials (Cambodia), a code of conduct for the Prosecutor's Office (Myanmar), codes of conduct for the judiciary (Micronesia (Federated States of), Viet Nam), the Uniform Code of Ethics (Panama) and bills on countering and preventing corruption (Eswatini, Gambia, Serbia, Thailand).

2. Assisting States in the development of anti-corruption policies and strategies

12. UNODC supported the development of various anti-corruption policies or strategies in 10 countries. The anti-corruption strategy of Kiribati was adopted in September 2017, whereas those of other countries were still in the development stage (Belize, Grenada, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kuwait, Myanmar, Qatar, Tuvalu and Vanuatu). In addition, policy assessments were conducted in Belize, Grenada, Jamaica and Qatar.

13. At the regional level, UNODC conducted a workshop for countries of the Latin American and Caribbean region in Panama City in November 2017 on the development and implementation of national anti-corruption strategies for officials from Belize, Grenada, Jamaica and Panama. The participants learned about the rationale behind preparing and adopting national anti-corruption strategies, the methodology designed by UNODC to identify priorities and how to effectively implement such strategies.

14. At the country level, support was provided to Kiribati, Kuwait, Myanmar, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. UNODC conducted a workshop on the development and implementation of an anti-corruption strategy and on the establishment of a corruption prevention unit for the Anti-Corruption Commission of Myanmar in January 2018. In Kuwait, UNODC, in cooperation with UNDP, provided advice to the Kuwait Anti-Corruption Authority (Nazaha) on the development of the country's national anti-corruption strategy, and in 2018, several workshops and meetings were held on the identification of priorities and outcomes, as well as on monitoring and evaluation, for stakeholders from Nazaha and key government counterparts. In September 2017, UNODC and UNDP jointly supported a second workshop in Vanuatu focused on revising and refining the draft National Anti-Corruption Policy and its implementation mechanism. In Tuvalu in April 2018, UNODC and UNDP jointly conducted a workshop on the development and implementation of an anti-corruption strategy.

15. In addition, UNODC representatives delivered presentations on the development, implementation and monitoring of anti-corruption strategies on various occasions, including at the seventeenth annual Anti-Corruption Day observed in Austria in May 2018.

3. Integrity, transparency, accountability and the rule of law in public administration

(a) Prevention of conflicts of interest, and asset declaration systems

16. In Cambodia, UNODC supported the Anti-Corruption Unit in the development of a code of conduct for public officials. At a workshop held in Phnom Penh in November 2017, UNODC representatives delivered presentations on balancing prevention and sanctions in conflict-of-interest regimes. Furthermore, in March 2018, UNODC held consultations with the Anti-Corruption Unit to assess the implementation of the asset declaration system, identify gaps and understand the relevant procedures. As part of the assessment, UNODC consulted with Transparency International Cambodia to integrate the perspective of civil society in regard to the asset declaration system.

17. Similarly, in Viet Nam, UNODC held consultations in March 2018 with several national stakeholders on current practices in implementing the asset declaration system aimed at identifying potential gaps and ways to strengthen the existing system. The consultations also included dialogue with the Vietnamese civil society organization Towards Transparency.

18. Furthermore, UNODC organized a two-day training workshop in cooperation with the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (StAR) on reforming the asset declaration and conflict-of-interest systems, held in Sri Lanka in March 2018. UNODC also held a workshop on conflicts of interest and asset declaration systems in Bangladesh in May 2018 for officials of that country's Anti-Corruption Commission.

19. In Grenada in December 2017, UNODC delivered a training programme on auditing asset declarations aimed at building the capacity of officials of the Integrity Commission, the Audit Department and the Director of Public Prosecution to identify cases of illicit enrichment.

(b) Transparency measures

20. In Vanuatu, UNODC and UNDP continued to jointly support the implementation of the recently adopted right-to-information policy by developing a user's guide for right-to-information officers, as well as other relevant supplementary documents. A training programme for the officers was subsequently delivered in April 2018.

21. Furthermore, UNODC supported, in cooperation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the development of an access-to-information law in Cambodia, providing comments on the draft law in early 2018.

(c) Reporting of corruption

22. UNODC supported three regional events focused on the protection of reporting persons and the establishment of internal reporting mechanisms within the public and private sectors, including anti-corruption agencies and other regulators: a conference of the Pacific Islands Law Officers' Network, held in Fiji in August 2017, a workshop for six South Asian countries, held in Maldives in November 2017, and a workshop for seven East African countries, held in the United Republic of Tanzania in March 2018. In preparation for the East African workshop, UNODC also conducted an initial assessment of the relevant legislation and practice in several countries, which will form the basis for further support efforts in that regard.

23. At the country level, UNODC provided comments on existing legal frameworks and bills to Greece, Kenya, Madagascar and Panama. In regard to Panama, for

example, legislative drafting assistance on the whistle-blower protection bill was provided jointly with Libertad Ciudadana in December 2017, and further assistance is being provided on an ongoing basis.

24. UNODC also provided substantive expertise at two national workshops on whistle-blower and witness protection. The first was held in Kuwait in March 2018 and the second was held in Timor-Leste in April 2018.

25. Globally, UNODC continued to advocate for better protection of reporting persons and to focus on the handling and investigation of reports. In that connection, representatives of UNODC participated in a panel discussion at the seventeenth session of the Committee of Experts on Public Administration, held on 25 April 2018. Subsequently, the Committee of Experts drafted a resolution for discussion and adoption by the Economic and Social Council that called for strengthened protection of whistle-blowers, building on the Convention against Corruption and the findings of the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (E/2018/44, chap. I, section A).

(d) Procurement and public finances

26. UNODC started the development of a handbook on corruption and fraud risk assessments to help countries better identify and mitigate corruption risks in furtherance of implementing article 9, paragraph 2 (d), of the Convention.

27. During the first quarter of 2018, detailed analyses of procurement systems were undertaken in five East African countries. The assessments generated information that served to underpin the discussions at a regional workshop on addressing corruption relating to procurement in East Africa held in the United Republic of Tanzania in March 2018. A programme of work to strengthen responses to corruption risks in procurement was agreed by the participating authorities.

28. At the national level, workshops to identify corruption risks in the procurement process were held in Indonesia and Cambodia in October and November 2017. Moreover, in February 2018, work commenced in collaboration with the Supreme Audit Institution of the United Arab Emirates to develop a guide on addressing corruption linked to the procurement of information technology.

D. Ensuring that anti-corruption bodies have the necessary competence

1. Designation of competent authorities

29. As noted by the Conference, many States parties had already informed the Secretary-General about the designation of competent authorities that might assist other States parties in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption, as required under article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention. The Conference called upon States parties that had not yet done so to provide such information or updates and subsequently received notifications from additional States parties. As of May 2018, the Secretary-General had received notifications from 113 States parties designating a total of 117 competent authorities. An updated list is available to competent authorities and government agencies from an online directory on the UNODC website (www.unodc.org/compauth_uncac/en/index.html).

2. Support to anti-corruption agencies

30. UNODC provided assistance and training to anti-corruption bodies in the implementation of their mandates in many countries. Such support included assistance in the investigation and prosecution of corruption offences, such as financial investigations, interrogation and interview techniques and case management, often to address recommendations emanating from the first review cycle. As that assistance was substantively linked to other chapters of the Convention

and did not fall within the main ambit of resolutions 7/5 and 7/6, it has not been included in the present paper.

31. The following anti-corruption bodies were supported by UNODC in the development of workplans and corruption risk management efforts: National Authority for Transparency and Access to Information (Panama); Anti-Corruption Commission (Myanmar); State Inspection and Anti-Corruption Authority (Lao People's Democratic Republic); Anti-Corruption Commission (Bhutan); Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery or Corruption (Sri Lanka); Anti-Corruption Unit (Cambodia); Corruption Eradication Commission (Indonesia); Anti-Corruption Commission (Timor-Leste); and Anti-Corruption Commission (Bangladesh).

32. For example, UNODC conducted consultations with the State Inspection and Anti-Corruption Authority of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to agree on an annual workplan and specific activities to address identified needs and build on the outcomes of previous training programmes. Consultations were undertaken in February 2018 with non-governmental stakeholders to forge partnerships for the implementation of relevant activities in the country.

Improving coordination of anti-corruption initiatives regionally and nationally

33. UNODC continued to implement its technical assistance in a layered approach, tailored to the specific topics being addressed. The Office facilitates the exchange of experiences and conducts awareness-raising and learning activities at the regional level in order to reach a broader audience, increase leverage and support regional agendas. More in-depth assistance is provided at the country level upon request.

34. At the regional level, UNODC coordinated closely with the East African Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities to deliver regional workshops on procurement and whistle-blower protection, as described in more detail in the respective sections of the present paper. Among the outcomes of the workshops was the decision to establish an ongoing regional and country-level coordination platform focused on combating corruption in procurement and sharing experiences related to whistle-blower protection.

35. With a focus on corruption as a cross-cutting issue and its interlinkages with other forms of crime, UNODC brought together South-East Asian fisheries management and anti-corruption specialists at a workshop in Thailand in November 2017 to promote and discuss the use of anti-corruption measures in the fisheries sector.

36. At the national level, many of the capacity-building workshops and training events described in the present paper included multiple national stakeholders (for example, anti-corruption authorities, officials from law enforcement, the judiciary and financial intelligence units, and representatives of civil society organizations and the private sector), with a view to facilitating improved domestic coordination among them to more effectively and efficiently address corruption risks.

E. Promoting the integrity and accountability of the criminal justice system

1. Global Judicial Integrity Network

37. After holding seven regional preparatory meetings, as well as consultations, with approximately 4,000 judges and other relevant justice sector stakeholders, UNODC launched the Global Judicial Integrity Network in Vienna in April 2018 in the presence of 350 senior judges and judicial professionals, including 35 chief justices, from 106 countries and 40 judicial associations or other relevant organizations. The two-day launch event provided an opportunity to discuss pertinent topics and emerging issues related to judicial integrity, develop recommendations on strengthening judicial integrity at the global level and establish priorities for the work

of the Network. The event concluded with the adoption of the Network's Terms of Reference and Declaration on Judicial Integrity.

38. The establishment of the Global Judicial Integrity Network is one of the key outputs of the UNODC Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration. The Network will promote peer learning and support activities among judges through virtual and in-person meetings, facilitate access to relevant resources and support the further development of knowledge products, tools and guidelines. The Network's dedicated website (www.unodc.org/ji) includes detailed information on the Network's services and activities, and provides access to an extensive online resource library and a restricted area through which Network participants can connect and interact.

2. Judicial integrity

39. Under the Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration, UNODC started the development of a judicial ethics training package consisting of an e-learning course, a self-directed offline course and a trainer's manual, based on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct and the requirements under article 11 of the Convention against Corruption. Several jurisdictions have agreed to pilot-test the tools included in the training package, and the first train-the-trainers workshop was held in March 2018 for trainers from seven participating jurisdictions. Additional workshops are planned for 2018 and 2019, and the tools are expected to be finalized by the end of 2018. The tools will be translated into the official languages of the United Nations and Portuguese.

40. UNODC has continued to support States in their efforts to strengthen judicial integrity. In 2017, six countries received assistance from the Office .n developing, revising and implementing codes of conduct, and 360 judges benefited from a variety of capacity-building events enabling them to exchange good practices and experiences relevant to the strengthening of judicial integrity and the prevention of corruption in the justice system. In 2018, a workshop was held in Viet Nam to finalize the draft Code of Conduct for the judiciary, and in Tunisia, UNODC supported the newly established High Judicial Council in evaluating the implementation of the requirements under article 11 of the Convention. UNODC continued to translate existing UNODC resources on judicial integrity into additional languages.

3. Prosecutorial integrity

41. UNODC, under the umbrella of its project on strengthening criminal investigation and criminal justice cooperation along the cocaine route in Latin America, the Caribbean and West Africa (CRIMJUST), held a workshop for several West African countries on regional cooperation and prosecutorial integrity in Ghana in March 2018. The workshop raised awareness about the Office's tools on those topics, enabled the participants to conduct mini-assessments of their national systems and promoted the sharing of experiences, challenges and good practices within and outside of the West African region.

42. At the national level, as part of a country project, UNODC supported the Attorney General of Myanmar in evaluating the implementation of prosecutorial integrity measures.

4. Law enforcement integrity, including in customs, border control and other agencies and prisons

43. In February 2018, UNODC supported Burkina Faso in the development of a strategy to prevent and combat corruption on the roads, including at check points and among traffic police officers. The initiative included South-South cooperation in the form of a study visit to Rwanda.

44. Under the framework of the CRIMJUST project, UNODC supported several integrity and accountability initiatives in law enforcement institutions. In West Africa,

at the request of the Drug Law Enforcement Unit of the Ghana Police Service's Criminal Investigation Department, the Office supported the development of a training manual on integrity and ethics and a train-the-trainers workshop. The training manual was used in two training courses involving a total of 50 participants in March 2018 and is planned to be integrated into the general training programme that the Police Service's Detective Training School delivers to new detectives on a regular basis.

45. In Latin America and the Caribbean, UNODC supported ethics training activities under various projects. In August 2017, the Vice-President of Panama launched the training course entitled "Basic Ethics Course for Public Officials: a Tool to Prevent Corruption", which was developed by the Regional Anti-Corruption Academy for Central America and the Caribbean and the National Authority for Transparency and Access to Information, in partnership with UNODC. The National Air and Naval Service of Panama, one of the key agencies in the fight against drug trafficking, decided to make the training course mandatory for all its officers and has trained 3,000 officers as of the end of May 2018.

46. In Central America and the Caribbean, UNODC, under the CRIMJUST project, promoted the institutional integrity of law enforcement institutions at multiple events, including, for example, at the fifth annual regional meeting of the Container Control Programme, held in the Dominican Republic in November 2017. Notably, after UNODC representatives delivered a presentation on the corrosive impact of corruption on successful investigations and prosecutions at the Twenty-seventh Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies (HONLEA), Latin America and the Caribbean Region, the Meeting adopted a specific recommendation calling for Governments to implement institutional integrity measures addressed to judicial, prosecutorial and law enforcement institutions (UNODC/HONLAC/27/6, para. 3 (d)). Furthermore, UNODC organized a study tour that included visits to the Office of the Inspector General of Colombia and the Office of the Inspector General of Ecuador by a delegation of police officers from the Office of the Inspector General of Panama and the National Directorate for the Control of Drugs of the Dominican Republic. Following the visits, several institutional reform plans were conceptualized, and it is expected that UNODC will provide further support for their development. To further assist in efforts to strengthen the integrity of law enforcement officers in Panama, UNODC supported the participation of the Deputy of the Office of Professional Responsibility of the National Police of Panama in the International Meeting of Inspectors General and Chiefs of Internal Affairs held in April 2018, which was organized jointly by the UNODC Colombia Office and the National Police of Colombia. The meeting provided an opportunity to exchange ideas on practical strategies to address common corruption-related challenges in the region and enabled the National Police of Panama to learn about various good practices in that regard.

47. UNODC developed the new *Handbook on Anti-Corruption Measures in Prisons*, which was launched on 8 November 2017 at a special event held during the seventh session of the Conference of the States Parties. Corruption in prisons poses a number of risks not only to the rights of prisoners, but also to the safety and security of prison administrators and society in general. The handbook, which was prepared in collaboration with the UNODC Justice Section, is aimed at filling gaps in the existing knowledge of approaches to preventing and combating corruption in the specific environment of prisons.

48. A UNODC representative delivered a keynote speech on corruption risk management at the meeting of the Integrity Subcommittee of the World Customs Organization held in Belgium in March 2018.

49. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-UNODC biannual staff talks were held in Vienna in February 2018 and included a discussion on the two organizations' collaboration in fighting corruption and building integrity in the defence sector. Subsequently, UNODC representatives participated in the "Lessons Learned" seminar of the NATO Building Integrity Programme, held in Lisbon in May

2018, with the aim of supporting NATO efforts to establish systems to identify good practices and failures in the context of promoting integrity in security operations.

F. Preventing and combating corruption in the private sector: promoting the development of standards and procedures to safeguard the integrity of the private sector in implementation of article 12 of the Convention

50. UNODC continuously supports regional and global efforts to strengthen public and private sector standards, for example, through its partnerships with the Alliance for Integrity, the Global Business Coalition, the Group of 20 Anti-Corruption Working Group, the Partnering Against Corruption Initiative of the World Economic Forum, the Corporate Social Responsibility Network of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Anti-Corruption and Transparency Working Group of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the United Nations Global Compact, national chambers of commerce and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), including its Development Assistance Committee's Anti-Corruption Task Team.

51. In Colombia, UNODC has been implementing a project aimed at increasing public and private sector dialogue and knowledge-sharing. The project has supported the Government of Colombia in reviewing and improving public policies and the legislative framework related to anti-corruption, in particular corporate integrity. Ten workshops to strengthen capacities to identify and address corruption risks were held in different localities in 2017 and involved the active participation of professionals from the private and public sectors, unions, academia and civil society.

52. UNODC and UNDP provided support to the Pacific Islands Private Sector Organization to develop and adopt a new code of conduct and an accompanying e-learning module. Subsequently, meetings and workshops on the localization of the code by local chambers of commerce and their members were organized in Niue in August 2017 and in Tonga in May 2018.

53. UNODC, along with representatives of the public and private sectors, co-organized an event held in Panama City on 27 October 2017 to commemorate the International Day for the Prevention of Money-Laundering. Also in Panama, in March 2018, a UNODC representative delivered a presentation on international standards to prevent and fight money-laundering at the Congress of the Latin American Confederation of Savings and Loan Cooperatives.

54. UNODC participated in a workshop on governance and institutions in the infrastructure sector held in Peru in February 2018, and provided input to draft of a declaration against corruption that was to be adopted at the 2018 Summit of the Americas, which was held in Lima in April 2018. At the Summit, Heads of State adopted and signed the resulting declaration entitled "Lima Commitment: Democratic Governance against Corruption" (www.summit-americas.org/viii/compromiso_lima_en.pdf), comprising policy commitments on advancing the prevention of and fight against corruption in the Americas and advocating for various measures involving the private sector.

55. In cooperation with the Regional Anti-Corruption Initiative (for South-Eastern Europe), UNODC delivered an anti-corruption capacity-building workshop for private sector and civil society actors in Sarajevo in September 2017. Furthermore, UNODC delivered a presentation on its work on prevention of corruption in the private sector at the Madrid Integrity and Compliance conference, organized by Ernst and Young Spain and held in Madrid in May 2018.

56. The interactive e-learning tool for the private sector called "The fight against corruption", which was jointly developed by UNODC and the United Nations Global Compact to enhance private-sector users' understanding of the Global Compact's 10th principle (against corruption) and the Convention against Corruption, is now

available in 23 languages, including Arabic, Bulgarian, Chinese, Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Kazakh, Korean, Norwegian, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish and Ukrainian.

G. Promoting education on the prevention of corruption

57. UNODC continued to implement the Education for Justice (E4J) initiative, a component of the Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration. The initiative is aimed at building a culture of lawfulness among children and youth through the provision of age-appropriate educational materials on topics related to criminal justice, crime prevention and the rule of law, including corruption, and the integration of those materials into the curricula at all education levels.

58. In the context of the E4J initiative, UNODC also signed an agreement with UNESCO with a view to developing educational materials on crime prevention and criminal justice issues, including corruption, for instruction at the primary and secondary education levels.

1. Academia

59. UNODC, under the E4J initiative, continued the development of teaching modules to help lecturers in universities and other higher education institutions enhance teaching on various topics related to crime prevention and criminal justice, including corruption, integrity and ethics. Fourteen E4J integrity and ethics modules for university lecturers were developed during the reporting period and were launched at the Regional Conference on Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean 2018 in Córdoba, Argentina in June 2018. An additional 14 E4J anti-corruption modules are currently being developed.

60. Under the Anti-Corruption Academic Initiative (ACAD), UNODC continued developing a Russian-language version of the Convention against Corruption Model Academic Course and updating the ACAD Menu of Resources. In May 2018, UNODC held a side event on the margins of the twenty-seventh session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice dedicated to the Office's anti-corruption-related academic activities.

61. In the Pacific region, UNODC supported several activities involving academia. In August 2017, to mark International Youth Day, UNODC, UNDP and the University of the South Pacific jointly organized a seminar on the role of young people in the fight against corruption. In May 2018, UNODC, UNDP and the Fiji Independent Commission against Corruption held an awareness-raising event for the Federal Council of the University of the South Pacific Students' Association.

62. In addition, during the reporting period, nine lectures were organized in cooperation with the International Anti-Corruption Academy to strengthen joint efforts in promoting anti-corruption education. UNODC also continued to deliver lectures to various universities or delegations, including a presentation on corruption and the Sustainable Development Goals made to students of the Regional Academy on the United Nations in Vienna in May 2018.

2. Awareness-raising in schools

63. Under the E4J initiative, UNODC undertook various outreach activities targeting students at the primary and secondary levels. During the seventh session of the Conference of the States Parties, in November 2017, the E4J initiative launched "The Zorbs", which tells the story of an imaginary planet and its inhabitants, who overcome a range of challenges by applying various core values (acceptance, fairness, integrity and respect) and skills (conflict resolution, critical thinking, empathy and teamwork) as promoted under the initiative. The series has been designed as a fun yet informative educational tool, and will include a set of animated videos, complemented

by an online interactive "comic creator" that encourages children to compose meaningful stories in an engaging and creative way. A six-minute pilot video that introduces the four lead characters and sets the scene for their adventures has been published and further episodes are in production.

64. At the secondary education level, the E4J initiative continued to support the updating of the mobile telephone application "Play Fair" in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, which seeks to promote ethical decision-making among young people. Thirty Bolivian secondary school students have been involved in testing the game. The initiative also supported the development of a non-electronic game on integrity, in partnership with Integrity Action. The game is being developed in Nepal and will be tested in Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya and the State of Palestine. In addition, the initiative launched the Resource Guide for Organizing Model United Nations Conferences (www.unodc.org/e4j/mun/index.html) to support the incorporation of crime prevention and criminal justice issues, including corruption, into Model United Nations conferences and other similar types of educational simulation.

65. Furthermore, in Doha in March 2018, UNODC delivered a presentation to sixth-grade students during Money Week Qatar to instil values regarding the importance of money, saving and responsible spending, with a focus on issues related to financial management, including currency counterfeiting and other financial and economic crimes.

66. In collaboration with UNDP and promoting article 13 of the Convention, UNODC delivered training sessions on values to prevent corruption for primary school children in four communities in Belize in October and November 2017.

3. Other work with youth

67. In the Pacific region, under the initiative entitled "United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project", UNODC continued its extensive work with young people. Following the Pacific Youth Anti-Corruption Innovation Lab, organized jointly by UNODC, UNDP and the Pacific Youth Council in 2017, and using the recently launched *Pacific Youth Anti-Corruption Advocate's Toolkit*, youth from the Pacific region organized a number of awareness-raising and advocacy events in Fiji in September 2017, and in Kiribati and Solomon Islands in October 2017. Moreover, UNODC and UNDP produced a short film on the work of young anti-corruption champions in the Pacific.

68. UNODC, UNDP and the Pacific Youth Council also piloted a youth anti-corruption train-the-trainers programme. Three training programmes were conducted for different groups in Fiji in October and November 2017 and in February 2018. In October 2017, UNODC, UNDP, the Pacific Youth Council and the University of the South Pacific organized a "poetry slam" for budding young poets to express their views on corruption through the medium of poetry.

69. In December 2017, to mark International Anti-Corruption Day, UNODC, UNDP, the Fiji Independent Commission against Corruption and the Ministry of Youth and Sports of Fiji organized a one-day awareness-raising seminar for youth in Fiji. During the event, a regional youth anti-corruption calendar, developed jointly by UNODC, UNDP and the Pacific Youth Council, was launched.

4. Publications and online tools

70. UNODC continued to develop global knowledge products, as described in the specific substantive sections of the present paper. The knowledge tools and publications were prepared on the basis of accumulated global and regional experience, and the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the Convention continues to be one of the key sources for identifying areas where tools are needed. The reviews also serve to collect information and examples and allow UNODC to

both validate and update laws in the legal library of the knowledge portal known as Tools and Resources for Anti-Corruption Knowledge (www.track.unodc.org).

71. UNODC publications concerning corruption-related issues were widely disseminated at relevant conferences, workshops and training events, as well as to counterparts and other stakeholders during country visits or on other occasions involving policy or advocacy efforts. The publications are also available electronically on the UNODC website.

H. Other preventive work and emerging topics

1. Work with other actors, including civil society actors and journalists

72. In 2018, under the project "Looking beyond: towards a stronger partnership with civil society organizations on drugs and crime", UNODC facilitated the participation of civil society organizations in two multi-stakeholder regional workshops, in the United Republic of Tanzania in March and in Senegal in May. The project also supported the establishment of three regional civil society anti-corruption e-platforms, currently hosted on the website of the UNCAC Coalition. The purpose of these platforms is to enhance the visibility of civil society organizations working in anti-corruption in the regions of South-Eastern Europe, South-East Asia and Africa, enabling them to network and promote implementation of the Convention. The platforms also help different stakeholders build partnerships and exchange updates on anti-corruption activities in the regions. Lastly, UNODC started work on a guidebook on potential entry points for civil society to promote and support the implementation of the Convention. The guidebook will include a section on prevention and is planned to be launched in late 2018.

73. Under the CRIMJUST project, UNODC worked for the first time with Transparency International as an implementing partner. Transparency International created a new tool under the project, the Criminal Justice Dashboard, to enable civil society actors to assess the transparency and accountability of criminal justice institutions, develop recommendations and actively participate in corruption prevention measures. The tool was launched at a joint event held in Vienna on 30 May 2018.

74. In the Pacific region, workshops to raise awareness and broker dialogue and coordination among government institutions and non-governmental organizations were organized in Niue in August 2017, in Nauru in March 2018 and in Palau in April 2018.

75. In addition, UNODC and UNDP jointly organized a regional workshop held in Tonga in May 2018 dedicated to media oversight of corruption, and hosted a panel session on the same topic at the Pacific Islands News Association Pacific Media Summit. One of the outcomes of the Media Summit was the decision to establish a network of Pacific investigative journalists under the Association.

76. Under the Sahel programme, UNODC continued providing support to the Cell Norbert Zongo for Investigative Journalism in West Africa, which organizes training courses and provides financial and legal support to investigative journalists in West Africa with the aim of strengthening their capacities to practice more professional journalism on issues of corruption, organized crime, terrorism and human rights violations.

2. Parliaments

77. UNODC continued its cooperation with the Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption (GOPAC) to strengthen the role of parliamentarians in the fight against corruption. In August 2017, UNODC and UNDP, in partnership with GOPAC, conducted a post-election induction workshop for members of the Legislative Assembly of Niue with an emphasis on countering corruption and codes of conduct.

78. In May 2018, UNODC and UNDP, in partnership with GOPAC, organized an anti-corruption awareness-raising workshop for the Legislative Assembly of Tonga, which was supported by the Assembly's Anti-Corruption Commission.

3. Environment and wildlife

79. UNODC continued its ongoing programmes to implement corruption risk mitigation strategies in partnership with the Kenya Wildlife Service, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Department of Wildlife and National Parks of Botswana. Furthermore, in October 2017 and April 2018, respectively, corruption risk identification exercises were undertaken with representatives of the fisheries sector of Namibia and the Uganda Wildlife Authority. As is the case with the aforementioned implementation programmes, both of these exercises are expected to lead to the development and implementation of targeted corruption risk mitigation strategies.

80. UNODC is currently producing a resource guide for policymakers on how to use anti-corruption tools to address fisheries crime, as well as an integrity guide for agencies tasked with managing wildlife resources and enforcing wildlife laws.

4. Integrity in sport

81. UNODC, together with Brazil, China, India, the Russian Federation and South Africa, co-organized a conference entitled, "Safeguarding Sport from Corruption", which was held in Vienna in June 2018. The aims of the conference were to raise awareness of good practices and to disseminate tools to help address corruption in sport. It was attended by over 250 officials from over 60 countries, including representatives of international organizations such as the Council of Europe, the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) and OECD, and sport organizations such as the Asian Football Confederation, the Fédération Internationale de Football Association, the International Cricket Council, the International Olympic Committee, the Union of European Football Associations and the Tennis Integrity Unit.

82. In addition, UNODC conducted a workshop on preventing corruption in sport for sport governance bodies, law enforcement officials and relevant stakeholders in Hanoi in August 2017. The workshop focused on how to conduct risk assessments and develop strategies to prevent corruption and competition manipulation.

83. A UNODC representative participated in the third LawInSport Annual Conference, entitled "Understand the rules of the game 2018", contributing as a panellist on good governance and anti-corruption in sport. The conference, held in London in September 2017, involved over 250 leading sports lawyers, sports executives, academics, students and athletes, who networked and discussed the key issues and developments in international sports law.

84. UNODC representatives participated in the second meeting of the informal working group of the International Partnership against Corruption in Sport to formalize the establishment of three International Partnership task forces and to enhance cooperation with relevant stakeholders in the field of sport integrity. The meeting was held in Paris in December 2017.

85. UNODC contributed to efforts to implement the Kazan Action Plan, adopted by the Sixth International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport, in particular by working closely with UNESCO and the Council of Europe and participating in meetings of the Working Group on Action 3 of the Kazan Action Plan, which aims to unify and further develop international standards in the field of sport integrity.

5. 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and United Nations programming

86. The Conference of the States Parties has recognized the importance of including the prevention of corruption in the broader development agenda, including through the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 16.

87. In that connection, UNODC and UNDP jointly organized a regional workshop on monitoring Sustainable Development Goal 16: supporting countries to track progress on the rule of law and access to justice, the fight against corruption, and effective institutions, held in Fiji in November 2017. The workshop brought together participants from 13 Pacific States and contributed to the implementation and monitoring of the 2030 Agenda in the Pacific region.

88. Target 16.5 of the Sustainable Development Goals calls on States to substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms. Two indicators of the prevalence of bribery in relation to public officials, involving private persons and businesses, respectively, have been selected to measure progress towards achieving target 16.5. In order to support States in their efforts to generate experience-based data, and prompted by the need to improve the reliability and validity of existing corruption metrics, UNODC teamed up with the Mexico-based UNODC-National Institute of Statistics and Geography of Mexico Centre of Excellence for Statistical Information and UNDP to develop a new corruption measurement initiative. A manual on measuring corruption by means of population- and business-based surveys was presented at a side event held on the margins of the seventh session of the Conference of the States Parties and is expected to be launched in mid-2018.

6. Gender

89. In line with the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, UNODC implemented a gender perspective in its policies and programmes in a cross-cutting manner. The Action Plan requires United Nations system entities to contribute to gender equality and the empowerment of women at the country and normative levels. UNODC continued to identify and integrate, as appropriate, gender-relevant aspects into its capacity-building initiatives and monitored the level of participation of women in training events.

90. UNDP and UNODC co-organized a symposium entitled "Celebrating women fighting corruption in South and South-East Asia", held in Bangkok in December 2017. The symposium provided a platform for women in leadership positions to share their experiences, and to raise awareness of ways in which women can be powerful agents of change in combating corruption.

91. In an effort to build on its experience gained in implementing programmes at the national level and other initiatives to enhance the gender dimension of its work, UNODC is planning to hold an expert meeting on the gender dimensions of corruption in September 2018. The meeting will seek to document good practices and lessons learned that can be shared with the wider anti-corruption community. These include the Office's collaboration with Saya Perempuan Antikorupsi ("I am a woman against corruption"), a movement led by the Corruption Eradication Commission of Indonesia and the gathering of data for the above-mentioned manual in relation to measuring progress made in achieving target 16.5 of the Sustainable Development Goals, as disaggregated corruption data remains very rare.

III. Delivery framework and resources

92. The Conference of the States Parties, in its resolution 7/6, requested the Secretariat to continue, in close cooperation with multilateral and bilateral assistance providers, to provide technical assistance to States parties, particularly developing countries, upon request and subject to extrabudgetary resources, with a view to advancing the implementation of chapter II of the Convention, including in the form of tailored assistance for participation in the review process for chapter II. The

Conference invited States parties and other donors to provide extrabudgetary resources for the purposes identified in resolution 7/6, in accordance with the rules and procedures of the United Nations. Furthermore, it underlined the importance of providing UNODC with sufficient and adequate funding to be able to respond to the increasing demand for its services, and encouraged Member States to make adequate voluntary contributions to the account referred to in article 62 of the Convention, operated within the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Fund, for the provision to developing countries and countries with economies in transition of the technical assistance that they may require to improve their capacities to implement chapter II of the Convention.

93. As showcased in the present paper, UNODC continued to support States parties in implementing the Convention, both through tailored legislative and capacity-building activities and through the development of tools that facilitate the delivery of assistance on the ground. Although such assistance covered the full spectrum of the Convention, the present paper is focused on the initiatives and activities undertaken to implement Conference resolutions 7/5 and 7/6.

94. Several global programmes enable UNODC to provide professional guidance, advice and expertise at the request of States parties. Among them are the following:

- Global programme to prevent and combat corruption through effective implementation of United Nations Convention against Corruption in support of Sustainable Development Goal 16
- Global Programme for Combating Wildlife and Forest Crime
- Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration: Towards the Promotion of a Culture of Lawfulness
- Strengthening criminal investigation and criminal justice cooperation along the cocaine route in Latin America, the Caribbean and West Africa (CRIMJUST).

95. The close cooperation with other technical assistance providers, in particular with UNDP, as noted in several instances in the present paper, has continued to be very fruitful.

96. Like the specialized staff located at UNODC headquarters, UNODC regional and national anti-corruption advisers have been instrumental in carrying out successful technical assistance initiatives. They provide rapidly deployable professional expertise at both the country and regional levels to facilitate the delivery of on-site guidance to States parties requesting assistance in strengthening legislation and institutions in furtherance of their implementation of the Convention. Their contributions to the implementation of resolutions 7/5 and 7/6 are reflected throughout the present paper.

97. At the time of writing, there was one global adviser based in Vienna and five advisers with regional responsibilities, one based in Fiji (for the Pacific region), one in Senegal (for West and Central Africa) one in Panama (for Central America and the Caribbean) and two in Thailand (for South Asia and South-East Asia). Reduced extrabudgetary resources have unfortunately led to a reduction in the number of regional advisers in recent years.

98. At the national level, there are advisers based in El Salvador and Guyana. The national-level advisory position designated for Qatar ended in April 2018. Furthermore, the UNODC field office network implemented comprehensive, on-the-ground anti-corruption projects in a number of specific countries, including Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, El Salvador, Egypt, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Myanmar, Nigeria, Panama and Paraguay.

99. UNODC expertise is highly valued by States parties and other stakeholders, and this is reflected in the increasing requests for assistance or participation in initiatives and workshops. This trend is expected to continue in view of the second cycle of the Implementation Review Mechanism.

100. Against this backdrop, increased and long-term support from development partners and other donors is imperative for continuing the essential work of the advisers and staff located at headquarters who provide specialized anti-corruption expertise.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

101. To fulfil its role of assisting the Conference in mapping the way towards effective prevention of corruption, the Working Group may wish to consider the progress that has been made so far in the implementation of resolutions 7/5 and 7/6 and propose ways to strengthen and support their further implementation by States parties.

102. The Working Group may also wish to consider the progress that has been made, as well as challenges, opportunities and recent developments, in the implementation of chapter II of the Convention and suggest future measures to be taken, including topic suggestions for the next round of thematic discussions, bearing in mind the Conference's decision in resolution 7/5 that the topic for 2019 would be lessons learned on the development, evaluation and impact of anti-corruption strategies (art. 5 of the Convention), while recognizing the recommendation by the Working Group to leave room within its agenda to add or amend topics of discussion to maximize the cross-fertilization of the discussions held by the Working Group and the Implementation Review Group.

103. The Working Group may wish to acknowledge the increase in technical assistance requests in relation to the provisions of chapter II and the resolutions on the prevention of corruption, and note that this trend is likely to continue under the second review cycle of the Implementation Review Mechanism. The Working Group may wish to call upon States parties and other donors to reconfirm their commitment to the prevention of corruption through the provision of financial support, in particular in the form of multi-year, soft-earmarked extrabudgetary contributions.

V.18-04326